

REMARKS:

Claims 1-19 are currently pending in the present application. Claims 1, 6-8, and 11-19 have been amended in connection with the Request for Continued Examination filed herewith. Specifically, the claims have been amended to recite that the dummy object has the same orientation as the object. Support for these amendments is provided throughout the present specification including FIGS. 20-23. No new matter is introduced by these amendments.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 103:

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8-9, 13, and 16-17 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyamoto et al (US 6,203,431) in view of Van Hook et al. (US 6,342,892), further in view of Streetfighter Collection. Further, claims 6-7, 11-12, 14-15, and 18-19 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyamoto in view of Van Hook and Streetfighter Collection as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Billyard et al. (US 5,579,454). Claims 1, 6-8, and 11-19 have been amended and the rejection is believed overcome thereby. Claim 1 has been amended to include clarifying language that “the orientation of said dummy object being the same as that of said object”. More specifically, applicants submit that the claims are patentably distinct in that Streetfighter does not teach or suggest the “duplicate image” as having the same orientation as the Streetfighter figure drawn at the first and second positions as recited in claim 1.

The examiner indicates in the advisory action that the image shown in Streetfighter is a fighter and that the dummy object is an image of a fighter at a previous time frame. The examiner further comments that the claims are silent with regard to the orientation and the timing of the duplicate object. Applicants believe that the rejections are overcome by the amendments for at least the reason that none of the art of record teaches or suggests the object and the duplicate object having the same orientation at the first and second positions forming the basis of the drawn objects. Further limitations as to the timing of the duplicate objects are unnecessary for distinguishing the art of record since the orientations of the object and dummy

object are recited as the same at the first and second positions. Thus, even if the “residual image” of the fighter (from an earlier time frame) in Streetfighter is construed to be a duplicate object (of an object in an earlier time frame), the positions of the object and duplicate object in the current time frame don’t enjoy the same orientation as required by the limitations of claim 1.

Claims 6 – 8, and 11-19 are also independent claims which are believed to be patentable over the art of record for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Moreover, the dependent claims recite additional limitations, and are therefore allowable for these reasons as well. However, in light of the above distinctions in the independent claims, further discussion of the dependent claims is deemed unnecessary. Thus claims 2-5, and 9-10 are allowable at least due to their respective dependencies from an allowable independent claim.

Conclusion:

Applicants believe that all pending claims 1-19 are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Russell N. Swerdon
Reg. No. 36,943

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
(510) 843-6200